



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

venience and hardship on the defendant against the benefits and advantages to the plaintiff, and the court's decision in this case showed that the scales were carried in favor of the defendant. See also 16 MICH. L. REV. 647.

INTERNAL REVENUE—FEDERAL ESTATE TAX—CHARGE ON RESIDUARY ESTATE.—Suit for instructions by executors against the trustee under testator's will, and others. *Held*, The Federal Estate Tax imposed by Act of Congress Sept. 8, 1916, as amended by Act March 3, 1917, and Act October 3, 1917, is chargeable entirely against the residuary estate and not apportionable pro rata among all devisees and legatees. *Plunkett v. Old Colony Trust Co.* (Mass., 1919), 124 N. E. 265.

The court in this case based its decision on the fact that the tax is characterized, in the titles of the relevant sections of the statutes, as an "Estate Tax," and that it is "imposed upon the transfer of each net estate of every decedent," and is to be paid out of the estate before distribution; fortified by two further considerations, viz. (1) the contrast between the terms of these acts and those of the War Revenue Act of 1898, (30 U. S. Stats. at Large 464), which imposed a tax on legacies and distributive shares; and (2) the design to establish an estate tax rather than a legacy tax, as clearly manifested in the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, to which the bill had been referred. Though the present case treats the tax as a charge upon the residue, the suggestion in the final paragraph of the opinion that the testator might have provided in his will for its ultimate incidence at some other point seems deserving of greater consideration. In the case of a will executed before the passage of an act, giving legacies to collateral relatives, and naming testator's children as residuary legatees, it was held unjust to the latter to deduct the tax *in toto* from the residue as in the case of administration expenses, and accordingly the tax was apportioned among the several legacies—*In re Douglass' Estate*, 171 N. Y. S. 956. This point was also given great consideration by the lower court *In re Hamlin*, 172 N. Y. S. 787, where the tax was charged to the residuary estate because the will contained no specific directions for apportionment; affirmed in 226 N. Y. 407, where the decision was based chiefly, as in the principal case, on the intention of Congress. In *Fuller v. Gale*, 78 N. H. 544, the tax was directed to be paid out of the estate and charged pro rata to each beneficiary, though the court indicates that it would have given effect to an express direction by the testator to the contrary. It is submitted that this decision was wrong, inasmuch as the legacies were for definite amounts, which seems inconsistent with an intention to give these definite amounts less the tax.

LIBEL AND SLANDER—QUALIFIED PRIVILEGES—COMMENT ON PUBLIC ACTS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS.—The defendant publishing company published comments and criticisms in its newspaper upon the punishment of prisoners in the penitentiary of which the plaintiff was warden. This included the publication of a convict's letter, stating that a person had been strung up with his hands above his head to force a confession. Action for libel brought by the plaintiff warden and the court found, that the evidence showed the matter to be